UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/115,273	07/14/1998	MATTHEW J. MASON	PLAT-01001US	1196

7590 04/01/2004	**EXAMINER**
Robert R. Lech, Esq.	NGUYEN, CAO H

Robert R. Lech, Esq.
Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP
21 East State Street
Suite 1650
Columbus, OH 43215-4243

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___3___ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Sep 9, 2003* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *17-24, 41-48, 65-72, and 81-87* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *17-24, 41-48, 65-72, and 81-87* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2.   Claims 17-24, 41-48, 65-72 and 81-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hayes, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 6,339,826) in view of Schneider et al. (US

Patent No. 6,105,027).

Regarding claim 1, Hayes discloses a configuration device configured to perform

configuration management functions on objects within said configuration management system

(see col. 7, lines 1-67); a server machine for executing said configuration device and producing

display information for said representation of said objects within said configuration management

system; and a network interface connecting said server machine to a network, wherein said

network interface is a web interface and said network is one of the Internet and an intranet (see

col. 18, lines 14-67 and figure 13); wherein said server machine transmits information produced

by said configuration device and said display information over said network for display on a

remote computer (see figure 1-2); however, Hayes fails to explicitly teach a display device

configured to display a representation of objects in a presentation having a tree display of objects

in configuration management system, and a content display that displays items selected in tree

display.

Schneider teaches a display device configured to display a representation of objects in a

presentation having a tree display of objects in configuration management system, and a content

display that displays items selected in tree display (see col. 22, lines 36-61). It would have been

obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a

display device configured to display a representation of objects in a presentation having a tree

display of objects in configuration management system, and a content display that displays items

selected in tree display as taught by Schneider client-server system of Hayes in order to provide a

user interface is painted by a tree rendering component that allows intuitive navigation and

interpretation of the tree structure; and wherein the transmitted information includes one of an

Active X component, Visual Java program, Java applet, and PERL program configured to utilize

the information produced by said configuration device in said presentation (see col. 27, lines 5-

50).

Regarding claims 18 and 42, Hayes discloses wherein said one of an Active X

component, Visual Java Program, Java applet, and PERL program are further configured to

provide access to selected of said configuration management functions (see col. 6, lines 14-67).

Regarding claim 19, Hayes discloses wherein said selected configuration management

functions include at least one of object state changes, object check-in, object check-out, create

package, difference of disparate objects, move package, promote package, demote package,

snapshot, approve, list version, list difference, remove item, notify, concurrent merge, cross

environment verge, interactive merge, execute user defined process (UDP); and state changes are

performed by drag and drop procedures utilizing said representation of objects (see col. 12, lines

1-64).

Regarding claim 22, Hayes discloses wherein said report generator generates said access

reports when the selected object is one of a user group, object, and environment; said package

based reports when the selected object is a package; and said version control reports when the

selected object is a package (see col. 15, lines 5-67).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Hayes discloses wherein said report generator is configured

to produce said reports in InfoReport report formats; and access reports include information

indicating which users and user groups have access to execute specified functions in an

environment; version control reports include a list of items organized by at least one of version,

check out parameters, branches, modification by user, modification by environment, and current

release; and said package based reports include a list of items organized by at least one of items

modified by packages, packages by state, time in state, and packages by form items (see col. 20,

lines 18-64).

Regarding claim 43, Hayes discloses selected configuration management functions

include at least one of object state changes, object check-in, object check-out, create package,

difference of disparate objects, move package, promote package, demote package, snapshot,

approve, list version, list difference, remove item, notify, concurrent merge, cross environment

verge, interactive merge, execute user defined process (UDP); and said method further comprises

the step of: performing said state changes by drag and drop procedures utilizing said

representation of said objects (see col. 21, lines 1-63).

As claims 44-48, 65-72 and 81-83 are analyzed as previously discussed with respected to

claims 17-24 and 41-43.

Claim 84 differs from claim 17 in that "a registration device configured to register an

application as associated with a type of version; and a view version device configured to, check

out a version from configuration management system, and execute an application registered as

associated with the version checked out" which set to reply upon Hayes (see col. 11-12, lines 1-

65).

As claims 85-87 are analyzed as previously discussed with respected to claims 1 and 85.

Conclusion

3.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. (see PTO-892).

Response

4.   Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,

Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 746-7239 may be used for

formal communications or (703) 746-7240 for informal or draft communications.

      Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For

after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the

document.

      Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Inquires

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Cao (Kevin) Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3972. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John W. Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax number for this group

is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 8, 2004